



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,288	08/23/2001	Gerald A. Pierson	34430-2011	1186
61269	7590	01/11/2008		
SERIOUS USA, INC. c/o TORYS LLP SUITE 3000 , P.O.BOX 270 79 WELLINGTON STREET WEST , TD CENTRE TORONTO, ON M5K 1N2 CANADA			EXAMINER VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
			ART UNIT 1791	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/938,288	PIERSON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 42 and 43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 42 and 43 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1791

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vogelgesang et al essentially for reasons of record.

2. Applicant's arguments filed October 30, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant submits that a prime facie case of obviousness has not been established and such is simply not agreed with. The applied reference teaches (col. 2, lines 35-36) that "the layer 12 is an injection molded plastic sheet". Hence, the disc would at least have some portion thereof that is injection molded, thereby seen to be inclusive of the recitation in claim 42 of "injection molding a compact disc". The disc does have a major elevational portion —encircled by fenders 20 and 22— where the optical grooves are contained. Indeed, the aspects found lacking in the applied reference are—(1) that the major elevational portion is bounded by **first** and **second** pairs of spaced apart outer side peripheries, the second pair of spaced apart outer side peripheries **being linear** and (2) that a radius between a center opening and the first pair of spaced apart outer side peripheries that are arcuate would be less than 1.6 inches. As can clearly be seen in Figs. 1 and 2 of the applied reference, the major elevational portion is bounded **by a circle**—not the instant first and second spaced apart outer side peripheries. However, as stated in the rejection, it is believed to have been totally within the skill level of the art to, in essence, expand outwardly the major

elevational portion of Vogelgesang et al so that the portions carrying the data would extend to the edges of the data card 10. This would in fact form a major elevational portion with side portions that are linear on the longer side of the card, while the remaining side portions would remain arcuate near the shorter side of the card. That is in fact exactly what applicant has taught in the instant specification and set forth in the claims and it is exactly this that is submitted to have been obvious over Vogelgesang et al. In doing so, the radius would in fact have been less than 1.6 inches, given that the dimensions of the card in Fig. 1 of the applied reference are the same as those in Figure 4. While applicant suggests that the applied reference teaches virtually nothing with respect to what is claimed, such is not persuasive for reasons just delineated. In short, it is believed that a prime facie case of obviousness has been established, contrary to applicant's comments.

**3. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1791

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot  
January 5, 2008

*M. Vargot*  
Mathieu D. Vargot  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1791

*1/5/08*